OIPE IAP66
NOV 27 2006
PATENT & TRADEMARK OFFICE

Doc Code: AP.PRE.REQ

PTO/SB/33 (07-05)
Approved for use through xx/xx/200x. OMB 0651-00xx
U.S. Patent and Trademark Office; U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Under the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, no persons are required to respond to a collection of information unless it displays a valid OMB control number.

PRE-APPEAL BRIEF REQUEST FOR REVIEW

Docket Number (Optional): ALPINE.001AUS

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail in an envelope addressed to "Mail Stop AF, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450" [37 CFR 1.8(a)]

on 11/13/2006

Signature: Yasuo Muramatsu

Typed or printed name: YASUO MURAMATSU

Application Number	Filed
09/752,476	01/02/2001

First Named Inventor: Joan L. C. Palango

Art Unit	Examiner
3625	Robert M. Pond

Applicant requests review of the final rejection in the above-identified application. No amendments are being filed with this request.

This request is being filed with a notice of appeal.

The review is requested for the reason(s) stated on the attached sheet(s).
Note: No more than five (5) pages may be provided.

I am the

- [ ] applicant/inventor.
- [ ] assignee of record of the entire interest. See 37 CFR 3.71. Statement under 37 CFR 3.73(b) is enclosed. (Form PTO/SB/96)
- [x] attorney or agent of record. Registration number 38,684
- [ ] attorney or agent acting under 37 CFR 1.34. Registration number if acting under 37 CFR 1.34 _____

Yasuo Muramatsu
Signature

Yasuo Muramatsu
Typed or printed name

949-753-1127
Telephone number

November 13, 2006
Date

NOTE: Signatures of all the inventors or assignees of record of the entire interest or their representative(s) are required. Submit multiple forms if more than one signature is required, see below*.

- [ ] *Total of _____ forms are submitted.

This collection of information is required by 35 U.S.C. 132. The information is required to obtain or retain a benefit by the public which is to file (and by the USPTO to process) an application. Confidentiality is governed by 35 U.S.C. 122 and 37 CFR 1.11, 1.14 and 41.6. This collection is estimated to take 12 minutes to complete, including gathering, preparing, and submitting the completed application form to the USPTO. Time will vary depending upon the individual case. Any comments on the amount of time you require to complete this form and/or suggestions for reducing this burden, should be sent to the Chief Information Officer, U.S. Patent and Trademark Office, U.S. Department of Commerce, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450. DO NOT SEND FEES OR COMPLETED FORMS TO THIS ADDRESS. **SEND TO: Mail Stop AF, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.**

If you need assistance in completing the form, call 1-800-PTO-9199 and select option 2.

OIPE
NOV 27 2006
IAP66
PATENT & TRADEMARK OFFICE

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Applicant	:	Joan L. C. Palango et al.	Group Art Unit 3625
Serial No.	:	09/752,476	
Filed	:	January 2, 2001	
For	:	METHOD OF BUILDING AN AUTOMOBILE ENTERTAINMENT SYSTEM	
Examiner	:	Robert M. Pond	

ARGUMENTS FOR PRE-APPEAL BRIEF REQUEST FOR REVIEW

Hon. Commissioner
of Patents and Trademarks
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Dear Sir:

In response to the office action dated June 13, 2006, the applicant requests review of the legal and factual basis of the final rejection in the above-identified patent application. This review being requested because of clear errors in the examiner's rejections and the examiner's omission of essential elements need for a prima facie rejection. This request is accompanied by a Notice of Appeal submitted concurrently herewith.

REMARKS

Claims 17-29 are pending where Claim 17 is independent. In the final office action, the examiner rejected all of the claims on the basis of the identical rejections as in the previous office actions dated June 24, 2005 and December 22, 2005. The most recent listing of claims is provided in the applicant's response dated March 21, 2006.

In response to the office action dated October 19, 2004, the applicant has added the feature "the steps of displaying and selecting main systems and sub-systems can be repeated in a back and force manner" to Claim 17 and explained the difference of this feature from the cited references at page 11 in the response dated March 21, 2005. Notwithstanding this response, the office action dated June 24, 2005 repeats the previous rejection with no substantive changes in the explanation of the rejection. The examiner failed to show any prima facie evidence that supports the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a). In fact, none of the cited references show distinction between the main system screen and the sub-system screen let alone switching between the two.

In response to the office action dated June 24, 2005, the applicant has added the feature "images of two or more different main systems and two or more different sub-systems are displayed during the steps" to Claim 17 and explained the difference from the prior art at pages 7 and 8 in the response dated August 24, 2005. Notwithstanding this response, the office action dated December 22,

2005 repeats the previous rejection with no substantive changes in the explanation of the rejection. The examiner ignored this newly added feature to Claim 17. The examiner failed to show any prima facie evidence that supports the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a). In fact, none of the cited references show distinction between the main system screen and the sub-system screen let alone the images of two or more different main systems and different sub-systems.

In response to the office action dated December 22, 2005, the applicant has added the feature "information as to whether a special kit is required or not for a particular component is displayed based on the fitment with the customer's vehicle" and another feature "notifying the customer when a combination of components resulted from a selection of component made by the user is incurable" to Claim 17 in the response dated March 21, 2006. The applicant has explained the difference of this feature from the prior art at pages 7-9 in the response. Notwithstanding this response, the office action dated June 13, 2006 repeats the previous rejection with no substantive changes in the explanation of the rejection. The examiner ignored the newly added features to Claim 17. The examiner failed to show any prima facie evidence that support the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a). None of the cited references show the idea of providing the information as to whether a special kit is required. None of the cited references show the idea of notifying the customer when a combination of

components resulted from a selection of component made by the user is incurable.

In conclusion, in view of the arguments presented in the responses dated March 21, 2005, August 24, 2005 and March 21, 2006, and the supplemental arguments presented herein, the applicant submits that the office actions fails to set forth prima facie rejections for the claims of the present invention. Accordingly, the applicant respectfully request a finding that the application is allowed on the existing claims.

Respectfully submitted,

MURAMATSU & ASSOCIATES

Dated: 11/13/2006 By: _____

Yasuo Muramatsu
Registration No. 38,684
Attorney of Record
114 Pacifica, Suite 310
Irvine, CA 92618
(949) 753-1127

AMD-AP01.006
111306